

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Objections to claims 3 and 10

Claims 3 and 10 have been amended to address the issues raised by the Examiner..

The Rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-14 and 18-23 based Owa

Claims 1-2, 5-14 and 18-23 are rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Anderson (US Patent 6,348,971). This grounds for rejection is respectfully traversed.

As indicated in the introductory portion of the present application, there is prior art dealing with the selection of printers to handle print jobs. Please note the discussion at paragraphs 0001 - 0010 of the present application. The prior art reference Owa falls into the sort of prior art cited by applicant in that it too does not handle situations where none of the available printers are set up to print a job with any sort of elegance.

The present application deals with how to handle situations where the available printers are just not adequate to handle a print job. See paragraph 0011 of the present application.

Before comparing Owa and the rejected independent claims, note what Owa teaches when none of the available printers are adequate for the job: consider steps S8 and S18 in Owa's figure 6 – if no printer exists which can handle the print job, Owa's print routine bails out by displaying a message at S9 saying, in effect, no printer can be selected to handle the print job (see col. 6, ll. 1-3). Does Owa tell a human how any of the available printers might be reconfigured to handle the print job? No.

So with this state of affairs, does Owa anticipate Applicant's claims? Well, the answer is clearly no. When trying to read the Applicant's claims on

Owa the Examiner either overlooks certain language of the claims or reads too much into Owa.

First consider the limitation “wherein the at least one printer has a plurality of different printing configurations at least one of which is manually configurable”. The Examiner attempts to read this on col. 3, ll. 51-65 of Owa on page 3 of the Official Action.

However, the passage pointed to by the Examiner states that printers have basic information (which the Examiner considers to be “configurations”). But it needs to be noted that each of Owa’s printer only has one “basic information” associated with it. There is nothing on the cited passage to suggest anything other than a one for one relationship between “basic information” and an associated printer. Indeed, look at Owa’s figure 3 where each printer only has one associated “basic information” associated with it. And if the Examiner believes that one basic information corresponds to multiple configurations, where is there any suggestion that “at least one of” those configuration “is manually configurable” as claimed? Owa is silent on the feature in the passage cited by the Examiner.

Second consider the limitations:

“iii) when one or more of the print jobs cannot be printed using said at least one printer on the basis of said plurality of different printing configurations, automatically determining at least one reconfiguration of the printer configuration(s) that would be capable of satisfying the printing requirement(s) of said one or more print job(s); and

“iv) performing such a reconfiguration of the printer configuration automatically or providing information to enable such a reconfiguration to be carried out manually”

In Owa “when one or more of the print job(s) cannot be printed” what happens? Owa bails out as mentioned above. Owa does not teach or suggest “automatically determining at least one reconfiguration of the printer

configuration(s) that would be capable of satisfying the printing requirement(s) of said one or more print job(s)" as claimed. The passages(s) cited by the Examiner involve the consideration of printers which are less than ideally suited for the print job (see, for example, the discussion in Owa concerning scaling the font sizes if the proper paper size is not available at col. 6, ll 6-27). No reconfiguration of a printer is occurring, either manually or automatically.

Claim 2 specifies what occurs if manual reconfiguration is needed. Claim 2 recites that "wherein step iv) comprises determining when said reconfiguration would require manual reconfiguration of said one or more printer(s) by a user of the printing system, and if so using the printing system to generate and present to said user instructions for manually reconfiguring said one or more printer(s) prior to printing of the print one or more job(s) by the printing system." In Owa if a printer cannot do the job, the user is told that and the process begins anew as explained at col. 6, ll 1- 5. Why the process begins anew isn't really explained here. Perhaps if the user asks for fewer copies to be printed, then the print job would pass muster? Owa doesn't say, but clearly Owa does not teach "using the printing system to generate and present to said user instructions for manually reconfiguring said one or more printer(s) prior to printing of the print one or more job(s) by the printing system" in the cited passage. The Examiner reads too much into Owa.

Similarly, independent claim 12 includes a manual reconfiguration limitation not taught by Owa and claim 12 also recites that "when one or more of the print jobs cannot be printed using said printer(s) on the basis of said current printing configuration, to determine automatically at least one reconfiguration of the printer configuration(s) that would be capable of satisfying the printing requirement(s) of said print job(s); and when said reconfiguration would require manual reconfiguration of said printer(s) by a

user of the printing system, then use the printing system to generate and present to said user instructions for manually reconfiguring said printer(s) prior to printing of the print job(s) by the printing system". Owa clearly does not teach "use the printing system to generate and present to said user instructions for manually reconfiguring said printer(s) prior to printing of the print job(s) by the printing system" as recited by claim 12.

Claim 13 recites "providing information to enable such a reconfiguration to be carried out by another". Owa does not meet this limitation in the passage cited by the Examiner.

Claim 14, as amended, recites "when the print job cannot be printed using the one or more printers in their current printing configuration, automatically determine at least one reconfiguration of the one or more printers that would be capable of satisfying the printing requirements of the print job; and perform such a reconfiguration of the one or more printers when such reconfiguration can be done automatically and providing information to enable such a reconfiguration to be carried out by another when such reconfiguration cannot be done automatically." Owa, as relied upon by the Examiner, does not meet this limitation.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the

Response to Official Action
Dated 28 January 2008
Re: USSN 10/632,132
Page 13

number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition
fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
transmitted electronically to Commissioner for Patents on

28 April 2008
(Date of Transmission)

Stacey Dawson
(Name of Person Transmitting)

/Stacey Dawson/
(Signature)

28 April 2008
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard P. Berg 28,145/

Richard Berg
Attorney for the Applicant
Reg. No. 28,145
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 facsimile